

Applic. No. 10/698,074

Amdt. dated June 29, 2005

Reply to Office action of April 5, 2005

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1 and 3-20 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, and 12 have been amended. Claim 2 is being cancelled herewith. Claims 19 and 20 have been withdrawn from consideration. The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error.

In item 3 on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 7 and 12 have been objected to because of the following informalities.

The Examiner stated that claims 7 and 12 both contain improper Markush groups. Claims 7 and 12 have been amended so as to facilitate prosecution of the application and now recite proper Markush groups. Therefore the objection to claims 7 and 12 by the Examiner is believed to have been overcome.

In item 5 on page 3 of the Office action, claim 5 has been rejected as being indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

More specifically, the Examiner has stated that it is not clear how the encapsulation material and the surface of the

Applic. No. 10/698,074
Amdt. dated June 29, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 5, 2005

contact can be exposed (i.e., flushed) during the injection molding and after the injection molding. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. Claim 5 recites "the surface of the encapsulation material is flush with the surface of the contacts after injection molding." The definition of flush from Webster's New World Dictionary is: level or even. Therefore, the claim recites that the encapsulation material is even or level with the contacts after the injection molding is completed. Accordingly, claim 5 meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Therefore, claim 5 has not been amended to overcome the rejection.

It is accordingly believed that the claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, first and second paragraphs. Should the Examiner find any further objectionable items, counsel would appreciate a telephone call during which the matter may be resolved. The above-noted changes to the claims are provided solely for cosmetic or clarificatory reasons. The changes are not provided for overcoming the prior art nor for any reason related to the statutory requirements for a patent.

In item 7 on page 4 of the Office action, claims 1 and 8-18 have been rejected as being obvious over Makimoto (U.S. Patent

Applic. No. 10/698,074

Amdt. dated June 29, 2005

Reply to Office action of April 5, 2005

No. 6,830,958) in view of Igarashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,780,676) (hereinafter "Igarashi") under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

It is appreciatively noted from item 8 on page 7 of the Office action that claims 2, 3, 4, 6, and 7 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 1 has been amended so as to include the subject matter of allowable claim 2. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable. Since claim 1 is allowable, dependent claims 3-20 are allowable as well.

Since only allowable claims remain, the early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is solicited herewith.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/698,074
Amdt. dated June 29, 2005
Reply to Office action of April 5, 2005

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner &
Greenberg P.A., No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

June ~~30~~ 2005

Lerner and Greenberg, P.A.
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101